



State Coordinating Council
for Community Transportation
SCC Meeting October 3, 2013

GSIL, Chennel Drive, Concord, NH

In attendance:

Members:

1. Phyllis Brooks, GSIL
2. Van Chesnut, AT
3. Kerrie Diers, NRPC
4. Rad Nichols, COAST
5. Fred Roberge, ESNE
6. Patrick Herlihy, NHDOT
7. Bill Finn, NHDOE
8. Roberta Berner, GCSCC

Members Excused:

9. Kelly Clark, AARP-NH
10. Beverly Raymond TCCAP/NCT
11. Charles Saia, GDC
12. Christine Schon, DHMC
13. Mary Ann Cooney, DHHS

Guests:

Dane Prescott, DOIT

Patricia Crocker, UVLSRPC

Terri Paige, Coordinator Belknap-Merrimack CAP

Rebecca Harris, TNH

Adam Hlasny, SNHPC

Ellen Avery, CVTC

Roseanne Fisch, Citizen - Centennial Senior Center

Vivien Green, President, NH Association of Senior Centers

Item 1: Chair Welcome and Introductions – A Consumer Moment: Roseanne Fisch and Vivien Green

Chair Roberge called the meeting to order at 1:30 pm and proceeded with introductions of members to the guests, Roseanne Fisch and Vivien Green from

Centennial Senior Center. Chair asked Rebecca Harris to read the TNH statement that she has presented at the Governor's Advisory Council on Intermodal Transportation (GACIT) hearings on the Ten-Year Transportation Plan. The statement summarized the transportation needs of seniors and individuals with a disability, and the importance of community transportation to making HHS plans for aging in place feasible and healthcare cost reductions for seniors as this population expands in the future. The conclusion is a request to restore state funding for public transportation providers back to 2009 levels.

Following that summary, he introduced Roseanne Fisch who is a participant in the Centennial Senior Center. Ms. Fisch, a retiree from a career as a social worker explained that she had served on the NH Driving towards Zero committee which is a DOT initiative working to reduce highway fatalities. As a senior on that committee she expressed concern about the lack of transportation options that often leads seniors to continue driving longer than they should. She contended that seniors would stop driving sooner if more affordable public transportation options were available. She believes people might be able to meet more needs for people without public funding if some innovations could be put in place. Discussion followed of the existing volunteer programs and of recent innovations in California that utilize social media for their Ridesharing programs to arrange rides, screen riders, and rate drivers.

Roberta Berner explained that there are no income restrictions on income for senior rides in NH and that anyone over the age of 60 could access some of the special transportation and volunteer programs around the state, but she did note that funding was not unlimited.

Vivien Green, Executive Director of Centennial Senior Center in Concord, emphasized that this lack of transportation options will become a crisis with the aging population. Volunteer drivers are often retirees and the new retirees may not want to volunteer to do that. She suggested that such systems might be under-utilized in urban areas but the needs of rural areas are quite different. Some policymakers have suggested that families fill the gaps in these needs but among the challenges

to families where the need for two incomes requires both adult children to work and the desire of seniors to remain independent.

Fred Roberge summarized that these are the very issues that the SCC has been advocating for sometime. He noted that NH is one of 4 states that provide no funding for public transit. Over the last few years some of the volunteer networks have been improved and are tied in with the public transit networks to help them become more productive statewide.

Rad Nichols expressed his excitement about having the guests at the table and invested in the issue of providing transportation because the professionals are struggling to effectively get their message out. He felt that the best chance for some form of new funding is to start with Senior and Disabled Transportation. The SCC is looking for partners to get the message across to legislators at the state level. The federal and local levels are maxed out in terms contributions. Fisch asked what a taskforce at her senior center could do and many suggested that contacting legislators and policymakers who hold the key to providing additional funding was in great need.

Bill Finn stated that it is important not to stereotype the individuals that might be able to provide the rides. For example High School Students might be a good resource. They recognized that there should be education so seniors who still drive might want to help provide rides for other seniors. Fred Roberge encouraged continued communication between Centennial Senior Center and other groups working on transportation. Terri Paige invited Ms. Fisch to participate in the volunteer network. The loss of independence with the loss of a license seems to be a pivotal place from which to message.

Vivien Green invited the SCC to meet at her Senior Center and have a dialogue with the individuals who participate there.

Item 2: Approval of Minutes of September 5, 2013. Van Chesnut moved and Rad Nichols seconded a motion to approve the minutes with correction to spelling of

Scott Bogle's name which has one g, not two. Vote: unanimous.

Item 3: Subcommittee Reports

Software Project

Patrick Herlihy reported that the 5 pilot sites have been visited and their business practices observed and summarized by the contractor, SBSS. They have met with SBSS around the project progress review each month. The leadership team met and suggested that the 5 member sites, DOT and DOIT and a representative of the SCC form a subcommittee to work through the implementation. They have reviewed the evaluation requirements of the NH Endowment for Health grant. Dane Prescott reported that the project is complex and each of these sites are similar, but not exactly the same which adds to the challenge.

He stated that a key goal is to look at common standard for data set that has to be achieved across the 5 partner regions. Regions will have the option of determining which tools they would like to use from the new product or whether to keep their existing data management and scheduling products. The 5 sites are: COAST, MTA, CART (Easter Seals), TCCAP and CATS.

Rad Nichols then reported on recent discussions with the Endowment staff and their requirements for evaluation. The Endowment remains committed to this project and have a thorough understanding of the complexity of the projects. Prescott suggested that there will be a wide range of tools available. These may help advance coordination and options for transportation.

Kerry Diers moved to form an implementation advisory committee consisting of an SCC Representative (Pat Crocker), 5 stakeholder pilot sites, DOT, and DOI. Fred Roberge explained that the Executive Committee members thought Pat Crocker could serve as the SCC representative and was qualified based on her past experience with a similar project. Roberta Berner seconded the motion to create the committee as described. Vote: Unanimous.

Managed Care

Fred Roberge reported that AMR had bought TMS and now just two brokers remain in the NH Managed Care picture, AMR and CTS of Connecticut. Fred Roberge said his organization has been working with the selected Medicaid brokers and following negotiation had signed a contract with Access2Care and CTS. Rad Nichols stated that COAST is not currently a Medicaid provider, but just learned that they have to become certified before they can start talking to the broker. They have submitted their application 3 times and the application is still not complete according to DHHS.

Communications Committee Rebecca Harris has worked on a new elevator pitch and foundation messages and provided copies of newly refined foundation messages. They will next be working on an elevator pitch for the riders. They will be looking at the old N/N communications plan and see which parts continue to be useful in the current environment.

Item 4: Report from TNH – Rebecca Harris discussed the organizational change process they were working on and announced that new funding had been received for TNH activities including a second year of NHEFH.

Item 5: Annual Report Requirements. Chair requested that Nashua and UVLSRPC staff work together on developing a draft of the SCC Annual Report. Fred suggested that the report contain regional updates, notes from the June meeting of SCC/NHTA, Software Project development, and the proposed need for revisions to original state coordination plan (Nelson Nygaard 2006). Rad Nichols will outline the Endowment work plan for implementation of the Software project. Pat Crocker will reach out to the RCCs for the updates and work with Matt Waitkins on editing and assembling the product.

Item 5: Review and Discussion of State Coordination Plan

Discussion of State of State Plan continued with Fred Roberge noting that the SCC has had a good discussion at the previous meeting, but the SCC will need to make decisions on how to proceed with scheduling an upcoming meeting with a facilitated discussion of this subject. Roberge suggest that TNH might be asked to be the

facilitator for such a discussion. Rad Nichols said both facilitator and a chunk of time will be required to have a successful discussion. Roberge saw this event to be similar to the meeting held several years earlier at AARP in Manchester. Van Chesnut suggested that they might do this by cancelling an NHTA meeting and dedicating a whole day with lunch to complete this. Funding for facilitation was not readily available. Fred Roberge suggested that the discussion occur on February 6, 2014. A location will be discussed. AARP's new location in Concord might be considered. The Foundation for Healthy Communities was suggested or Bill Finn can see if their conference room in the Walker building might be available. The room should be large enough to accommodate about 40 people. Kerry Diers suggested that one facilitator might not be effective with such a large group. She said if you want a concrete product she suggests more than one facilitator would need to be deployed. Maryann Cooney's suggestions for structure of the discussion sounds like a good starting point. RCC's should participate. Van suggested the document itself is not user friendly and needs revision even if structure were to remain the same.

The SCC will ask each region to give feedback on the current structure of the plan and respond to a survey to answer a number of questions. Names of RCC Chairs and the information for the annual report will be solicited. They will be given a link to the existing coordination document on the DOT website.*

<http://www.nh.gov/dot/programs/scc/documents/RodmanNHCoordreport.pdf>

All concurred that the plan review needs to be broken down into key points so that enough information is assembled to lead the group through a facilitated day. The regional survey will seek:

- Feedback on the current overall structure of each region and how it relates to the original coordination plan?
- How is coordination working in your region?
- How can coordination be moved forward with existing resources?

Roberta Berner noted that all SCC members need to go back and relook at the plan. Van Chesnut suggested that the Regions be asked to take stock of successes and ask how they managed to accomplish those things as well as and about any

concerns they have as we move forward with a plan revision? Specifically he thought the questions outlined by Maryann Cooney in September 5 minutes were very good (attached for reference). Regional Councils and the SCC should identify strengths and weaknesses of the plan, what works and not...and why...and any Action Steps needed and then comment on the funding piece which is a significant aspect. Kerrie Diers will develop an agenda based on the preceding.

Item 6: Public Comments - Shelley Winters 5310 vehicle date extended to November 15 to accommodate RCC meeting schedules. Federal capital share will now be 85% and 7.5% State and 7.5% Local will now be the match. Manchester Chamber of Commerce is holding an Economic Development Summit on October 9. The session will be all day and one part is devoted transportation. Patrick Herlihy is one of the panelists/guest speakers.

Item 7: Next Agenda Items - continued work on the outline annual report, discussion of coordination plan...Committee Updates. Review Nelson Nygaard Plan. Van Chesnut moved and Patrick seconded a motion to adjourn at 3:34 PM.

Approved: SCC Meeting on Thursday, November 7, 2013, GSIL, Concord, NH.

1. Identify Plan's underlying assumptions
 - Medicaid funding streams available for integration into a coordinated system
 - Availability of seed funding
2. Legal Status of RCCs
 - Sustainability of status within RPCs
 - Review each RCC and its actual role(s)
 - Lack of demonstration funding
 - No foreseeable funding
3. RCC role and ability to meet charge re.: 5310 funding
 - RTC selection
 - 5310 recipient identification
4. Authority of SCC
 - Can the SCC actually meet its obligations as identified in Plan?
 - What is its actual authority?
 - What have we accomplished? How did we get there (divergence for Plan)?

Fundamentally:

Is the model as envisioned in Plan realistically achievable?

What can we learn from what we have accomplished?

MaryAnn Cooney suggested the SCC:

Take one of the monthly meetings and extend it for two – three additional hours.

Conduct a Facilitated session with very structured time frame to avoid getting off target

Review goals – original Charter

Define what's new to the "environment"

Take the Recommendations and Action Plan bullet by bullet and summarize our progress toward reaching them and divide them into:

- a) are they still relevant?
- b) what are we doing that we want to keep working toward or doing?
- c) what should we discontinue or "throw away"?

Define new short term objectives given the new environment